

#### REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of a second substantive office action on the merits of the application. Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11 were pending in the application at the time of the action was taken. All those claims are presently subject to rejection.

The examiner approved the proposed drawing correction filed as Paper No. 8 on January 16, 2003. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings were required in reply to the presently outstanding office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Please find transmitted herewith formal drawings revised to incorporate the changes made by the filing of January 16, 2003.

The examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5 under U.S.C. §103(a). It was the examiner's position that those four claims are obvious in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,266,397 (Stoner).

Claims 4 was rejected under the same statutory basis. In making that rejection, the examiner took the position that, given the teachings of the Stoner patent, Claim 4 is obvious in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 5,343,509 (Dounies).

Claim 6-9 and 11 were also rejected under §103(a) of the Patent Act. In making that rejection, the examiner took the position that, given the teachings of the Stoner patent, those five claims are obvious in view of the teachings of United States Patent No. 6,104,784 (Robbins).

Applicant hereby amends his application. Claim 1 has been amended by this document. Claims 7, 10, and 12-14 were cancelled by a previous AMENDMENT. Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11 remain pending in the case. Reconsideration by the examiner and allowance of the application are hereby solicited.

Claim 1 has been amended. It defines an emergency message processor for providing emergency message initiator information to an emergency system. The processor is in a network having related multiple transmission sources. The processor includes an information storage unit associated with the network. The information storage unit maintains emergency message indicia, representative of the multiple transmission sources, to be transmitted under emergency circumstances, and destination address information to which the indicia is to be transmitted. Further, the processor includes an initiator for implementing transmission of at least some of the emergency message indicia, representative of a transmission source implementing transmission under emergency circumstances, into the emergency system. The initiator implements

such transmission with minimal volitional activity. Finally, the emergency message processor includes means for updating emergency message indicia and providing, from the information storage unit, updated emergency message indicia, representative of a transmission source capable of implementing transmission, to an emergency system database.

It is respectfully submitted that neither the Stoner patent nor any other reference of record, by itself or in combination with other prior art, either anticipates or renders obvious Claim 1. Stoner uses a transmission path that is outside of the emergency system. It must incorporate a piece of adjunct equipment in the emergency system to function. It does not, therefore, include "an initiator for implementing transmission into the emergency system..."

It should be borne in mind that the emergency message processor in accordance with the present invention drives the identification of the transmission source in the network of multiple transmission sources without the need for any adjunct equipment. This is an important feature of the invention.

Further, Claim 1 defines means for updating emergency message indicia and providing, from the information storage unit, updated emergency message indicia, representative of a transmission source capable of implementing transmission, to an emergency system

database. Not only does the emergency message processor of the present invention drive the identification, but it also serves to constantly update a database in the emergency system. It is, therefore, harmonized with the emergency system. Again, no additional adjunct equipment is necessary.

Neither the Stoner patent nor any other prior art of record incorporates such structure. Certainly, the structure taught by the prior art does not suggest the obtaining of the advantages of the present invention.

Similar arguments are offered with respect to Claim 6. Claim 6 defines, in greater specificity, structure which obtains the advantages discussed and argued above.

In view of the amendments made by this paper and these arguments, it is sincerely believed that independent Claims 1 and 6 patentably distinguish over the prior art. All claims other than Claims 1 and 6 retained in the case are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the independent claims. As such, they incorporate therein all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. The dependent claims are, therefore, patentably distinguishable over the prior art on the same basis as is the independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the action taken by this paper and these arguments, it is sincerely believed that this case is now in condition for

allowance. Allowance of the application and passing of the file for issuance of a patent thereon are, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin D. Moody

By his attorney

Date July 18, 2003

Lawrence M. Nawrocki  
Lawrence M. Nawrocki  
Reg. No. 29,333  
NAWROCKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.  
Suite 401, Broadway Place East  
3433 Broadway St. N.E.  
Minneapolis, MN 55413  
(612) 331-1464